DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 984 SO 020 220

AUTHOR Hodgkinson, Harold
TITLE The Context of 21st-Century Civics and Citizenship.
PUB DATE 5 Oct 88
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on the Future of Civic Education (Washington, DC, October 5-7, 1988). For related documents, see ED 308 100-101 and ED 307 187-188.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Civics; Educational Change; Educational Demand; *Educational Planning; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); Long Range Planning; Population Growth; *Population Trends; Racial Composition; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS Twenty First Century

ABSTRACT

Demographic analyses and projections provide a reasonably good portrait of the students of the 21st century and should be considered when planning for their education. Melding U.S. fertility and immigration data, it is clear that the future of the United States will be steadily more minority and less white. Shortly after the turn of the century, one out of three adult U.S. citizens will be non-white. The most conservative projection estimates that 48 percent of students will be minorities. Were the United States still a youth-oriented society, the prospects of marshaling the resources necessary for the schools to serve the variety of ancillary missions expected (day care, recreation, etc.) while successfully meeting pressing educational challenges might seem bright. However, the United States is a rapidly aging society faced with difficult resource allocation choices. One choice may well be between education and health care. The schools of the 21st century face the challenge of educating future citizens within the context of an entirely new order of pluralism. More than ever before, these students will be characterized by poverty, native languages other than English, physical and emotional handicaps, and ethnic and cultural diversity. Astonishingly, despite these inevitabilities, the present concern is with tightening standards for educational outcomes, rather than taking steps to ensure that every child has a reasonable chance of attaining them. Demographically, it is the wrong time to orient schools toward serving as screening mechanisms. Schools are needed to create winners, not pick winners. The goal should be to make sure that every child succeeds in school. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310984

THE CONTEXT OF 21ST-CENTURY CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP

SO020320

Based upon a presentation made by

HAROLD HODGKINSON

to the "Citizenship for the 21st Century" conference

October 5, 1988

Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harold Hodgkinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This is a conference about the future of civic education, but it is hardly an occasion for futurism, and I am not a futurist in any event. Futurists do not have a very impressive record of accurate forecasting. If you were to re-read Megatrends today, for example, you would find that about half of it has already proved wrong. Futurists tend to intuit the future and rarely share the assumptions underlying their projections. Demographers, on the other hand, make projections about the future by looking very carefully at the present - far more carefully than most people are used to doing. In a very real way, the future leaves "footprints" in the present and demography can be enormously helpful in finding and interpreting these footprints.

In recognition of its great utility, demography has been dubbed "the celestial mechanics of the social sciences" by Kenneth Boulding (1984). Put more modestly, demographic projections are better predictors than most. For example, one of the best predictors of the future adult population of a state is the current elementary school population, because kids grow up and become the adult population. A majority of California's elementary school students are currently minorities. Absent dramatic changes in in- or out-migration, we can predict with a high degree of confidence that by the year 2010, members of minority groups will constitute a majority of the adult population of California.

In considering civics and citizenship in the 21st century, we employ our demographic tools like radar, scanning the environment and then developing issues out of what we observe on our radar scopes. Detecting the "blips" is easy, figuring out what the blips represent is more complex. It is easy to misread class as race and race as class, for example, as we will see in more detail later. Similarly, national data can mask regional

differences, regional data can mask state differences, and so on. Nevertheless, cautiously employed, demographic analyses can help us to understand who the citizens of the 21st century will be and what some of the contours of their civic experience will look like. This knowledge, in turn, can be of great assistance in framing an educational agenda for the future.

DEMOGRAPHICS AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

A simple demographic concept directly related to civics at the national level is population density. Population densities vary quite a bit from state to state and from region to region. The ten most populous states (California, New York, Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Florida, Michigan, New Jersey and Massachusetts), for example, contain fully half of the nation's people. Viewed from a regional perspective, half of the population of the United States resides within the Eastern time zone, with an additional 30 percent located in the Central time zone. Although the country will continue to be dominated by Eastern and Midwestern regional values and densities for some time, the trend is clearly towards the South and the West. The "Sunbelt" states stretching from North Carolina through Florida to Texas, Arizona and California are racking up big increases in population, and these translate into political power in the form of seats gained in the United States House of Representatives.

The 21st-century House of Representatives is likely to be different in a number of ways besides simply the relative apportionment of seats among states. The states of the South and West that are gaining in population are doing so through two principal mechanisms: high minority fertility and

immigration. Blacks, Hispanics and Asians are fueling increases in population densities in these states, not Caucasians. As we have already noted, California will be populated by a "minority majority" shortly after the turn of the century. At least nine other states will quickly follow suit. This development has implications for candidate profiles, issue agendas and a variety of other civic concerns.

Another demographic trend of civic import concerns the growth of metropolitan areas. Development does not respect state boundaries. The largest metropolitan area in both Arkansas and Mississippi, for example, is Memphis, Tennessee. Similarly, the largest metropolitan area in Iowa is Omaha, Nebraska, while the largest in the state of Washington is Portland, Oregon.

The sprawl of metropolitan areas across state lines, moreover, is not confined to any given region. It is a national phenomenon. Segments of metropolitan areas in different states are in the difficult position of being economically interdependent, but politically independent. This development represents a new "twist" on the concept of federalism and poses unique challenges to state governance and interstate relations.

Federalism, whereby the federal government and the states share power, is a fluid set of relationships. Historically, the balance of power has trended decidedly toward the federal side of the ledger. Recently, however, another shift has occurred that has gone virtually unnoticed. Nearly every candidate for national office runs against the "ever-expanding, bloated federal bureaucracy." It's a popular argument, except for the data.

While the federal bureaucracy may be bloated, it is not ever-expanding. Indeed, the number of federal workers has held steady at roughly 3 million

since 1952. During the same period, state workers have increased in number from 1 million to 4 million, with much of the increase representing employees of state university systems, which expanded rapidly after World War II. The real explosion in government personnel has occurred at the local level, which has expanded from 3 million to over 10 million employees. These are the people who administer the myriad federal and state programs providing services to citizens. A profound change in bureaucracy occurred at the local level as we geared up to administer the "Great Society" programs of the 1960s, and yet the change has gone virtually undetected. Federalism is still viewed largely as a dual, federal-state relationship rather than as a federal-state-local triad.

Two very large constituencies for government programs and services are the dependent young and the dependent elderly, and we are now approaching parity in their numbers. The United States is a rapidly aging nation. At the present time, there are over 2.2 million people over the age of 85 and 24 million over 65. The former cohort is the most rapidly growing age group in American society. The latter, for the first time, came to outnumber teenagers as of 1983. The political consequences of the "greying" of America will be momentous.

Intergenerational conflict is quite likely. Dependent youth require costly educational services. Dependent elderly require costly medical services. In the early 1900s, there were eight children needing education for each elderly person. Today, there are two elderly people in need of services for each child in school. Since the elderly have completed their educations (as have their children), their interest in educational issues will likely have little to do with their perceptions of self-

interest. In a conflict over resources, it seems a foregone conclusion that HeadStart would fare badly against Medicare, for example.

Shortly after the year 2000, the 70 million people constituting the "Baby Boom" will begin to retire and draw social security benefits. When the system was initiated, 17 workers supported the benefits of each retiree. The current ratio of workers to retirees is 3.4 to 1, and declining, putting tremendous pressure on the social security system. As we move into the 21st century, an aging white workforce will be dependent upon an increasingly minority workforce to support them. Of the 20 million new people added to the workforce between now and the year 2000, 82 percent will be a combination of female, minorities and immigrants. Intergenerational conflict may thus have ethnic overtones as well.

The civic consequences of demographic change are by no means confined to the United States. All of the NATO countries have experienced major birthrate declines in the last few decades. As a result, "The West," which accounted for 30 percent of the world's population at the end of the 19th century, accounts for only 14 percent today and will represent only 8 percent of the world's population by the year 2025. Cast somewhat differently, only 18 percent of the current population of the world is white, and this figure is declining as nine out of ten children are born in developing nations.

The world of the 21st century will be "post-European" in several senses. In terms of trade, European dominance will continue to decline as both the absolute and relative size of European markets shrink. As middle classes develop in the Third World, the significance of these markets will naturally increase. Only 7 percent of the current population of India is

middle class, but it must be remembered that 7 percent of India constitutes a market larger than the entire population of France. As markets are becoming more global, so are corporate strategies for capturing them. International corporate alliances, whereby companies from a variety of countries share specialized expertise and engage in cooperative ventures, are becoming increasingly common. Some 600 such alliances transcending national divisions exist at present. Their continued growth may represent a considerable force promoting world stability, as economic communities of interest bridge political, cultural and other differences between nations.

In terms of the cultural heritage of the United States, the post-European era will arrive at the beginning of the 21st century. Shortly after the year 2000, the dominant background of Americans will be non-European. If we go back to the grandparent level, most Americans will be descended from Americans, South and Central Americans, and Asians. The currently popular perspective of Europe as the only "true" origin of American culture, literature and values is debateable to begin with, and certainly increasingly inaccurate. The history, traditions and values of Asia and the Third World are becoming more and more relevant to the evolving culture of the United States.

THE DEMOGRAPHY OF 21ST CENTURY CITIZENS

As we have seen, simple demographic concepts such as population density and age can tell us a great deal about the context of 21st century citizenship. Much can also be learned about the students who will receive citizenship training in the schools. Indeed, the student profile may have a

profound effect on the nature and scope of the training that should be provided by schools. In this section, we will look at demographic projections in terms of four major concepts: fertility, region, race and immigration. We will then try to pull our profile of the citizens of the 21st century together and evaluate its implications for the nation's schools.

Fertility

As a general rule, women must produce 2.1 children each in order for a population to be stable: one child to replace Mom, one child to replace Dad, and .1 to cover the effects of infant mortality. The most important single fact about demographics in the United States is the decline in white fertility from 2.9 per female during the Baby Boom to the current rate of 1.7. Today, 50 million women are producing fewer children than 33 million women did during the Baby Boom. Although the decline in white fertility has not been mentioned in any of the dozens of commission reports concerning the state of education in the 1980's, the dramatic change it has wrought in student profiles is a major factor contributing to the apparent crisis in American public education.

There are three major factors underlying the precipitous decline in white fertility. First, marriage has declined in popularity. There are currently millions of single people of marriageable age in the country, but they are not getting married. Single people produce relatively few children. Second, of those who <u>are</u> marrying, a significant proportion are predicating their marriages on not having children, or are at least

deferring childbearing to a point where only one or two children are likely. Finally, unlike the Baby Boom years, a majority of women are now in the workforce. And conflicts between maternal and career aspirations are being resolved in favor of the latter. Many working couples prefer the benefits of being "DINKS" (double income, no kids) to the rewards of parenthood.

Despite these trends, because of the extraordinarily large cohort of women of child-bearing age, there has been a small increase in the number of births recently. Between 1980 and 1984 there was a 9 percent national increase in the number of children under 5 years of age. This national figure, however, masks significant regional variations. The increases in the Northeast and Midwest were 5 percent and 2 percent, respectively. In the South and West they were 11 and 17 percent. Indeed, 73 percent of the overall increase occurred in just five states (Texas, California, Florida, North Carolina, and Arizona), all of which have high minority birthrates.

The "Norman Rockwell" family, consisting of a working father, a housewife mother, and two school-age children, is an endangered species. With 70 percent of children having working mothers, and given the decline in white birthrates, it is not surprising that only 7 percent of U.S. households currently match this profile. In the absence of a mass exodus of women from the workforce and a major increase in white fertility, the chances of this form of family organization re-emerging seem quite remote.

Another major fertility trend is reflected in the burgeoning number of children raised by a single parent. Overwhelmingly, the single parent is female, and many of them lack significant job skills and access to employment training. Accordingly, it should be no surprise that the "new poverty" among children is primarily a result of having a single parent. An

unprecedented 24 percent of all children are living below the federal poverty level. A variety of factors (e.g., divorce, abandonment) contribute to the increased incidence of single-parent families, but one of the most troubling is teenage pregnancy. Although there were far fewer teenage births in 1985 than in 1970 (478,000 v. 650,000), in 1970 seven out of ten teen births occurred within the context of a marriage, albeit frequently a last-minute marriage. In 1985, the majority of teen births occurred outside of marriages, resulting in further increases in single-parent families and exacerbating youth poverty.

A final trend of note is the increased production and/or diagnosis of children with physical or emotional handicaps. Mainstreaming, medical advances increasing the survival rates of very premature babies (often at the cost of permanent learning impairment), and family instability are all factors contributing to this growing challenge to the nation's schools. The increased prevalence of two-income families may also be a factor bearing on the emotional health of today's children. According to The American Chicle Youth Poll (1987), fear of kidnapping is the single greatest matter of concern to young people, far outdistancing nuclear war, AIDS, pollution and divorce. Not surprisingly, this fear is particularly common among "latchkey" children.

The trends we have noted in this section stand out in vivid relief because of one overriding development: the decline of white fertility. If white birth rates were still at the Baby Boom level of 2.9 per female, no proportionate increase in minority children would be observed except for the influence of immigration.

Region

As we have already noted in some respects, different parts of the country are becoming more unlike in meaningful ways, and it is important to account for these differences in the educational policy making process. National enrollment trends, for example, mask substantial state variations (see Figure 1). Change in Maryland is in the same direction as at the national level, but at a generally much higher rate. Trends in Arizona run counter to both. A national education policy tailored to the situation in Arizona may be entirely inappropriate to Maryland. Moreover, within individual states there may be substantial city, county and community variations. When making decisions about schools, one must be very sensitive to such potential differences.

Figure 1 - School Enrollment Trends*

		1970	1982	Percent Change
U.S. Total	K-12	45,909,000	39,643,000	-14
	9-12	13,332,000	12,501,000	-6
	K-8	32,577,000	27,143,000	-17
Maryland	K-12	916,000	699,000	-24
	9-12	252,000	237,000	-6
	K-8	664,000	462,000	-30
Arizona	K-12	440,000	510,000	+16
	9-12	126,000	151,000	+20
	K-8	314,000	359,000	+14

* Source: The Condition of Education, p. 16.

When we compare states with the best high school retention rates to those with the lowest, some interesting patterns emerge (see Figure 2). Are the top ten states blessed with better teachers or willing to invest more money in education? No. The pattern reflects the fact that these states have small cities and towns, small schools, low classroom densities, little ethnic diversity and few ghettos. These factors (as well as an inhospitable climate during much of the school year) are all related to better retention. Because most of these states are in the Midwest, which as we have seen is a low-fertility area, their influence at the national level will diminish over time.

Figure 2 - High School Retention Rates*

	State	Percent		State	Percent
	The Top Ten			The Bottom Ten	
1	Minnesota	86.0	41	California	68.0
2	North Dakota	84.9	42	Kentucky	67.3
3	Iowa	84.8	43	Alabama	67.1
4	South Dakota	82.8	44	North Carolina	67.1
5	Wisconsin	82.3	45	Tennessee	66.7
6	Nebraska	81.3	46	New York	65.9
7	Montana	80.9	47	Georgia	64.3
8	Kansas	80.5	48	Florida	63.7
9	Utah	80.2	49	Louisiana	63.4
10	Wyoming	80.0	50	Mississippi	61.8

* Source: All One System, p. 11.

The states with the lowest retention rates also share some interesting characteristics. With but two exceptions, California and New York, these are Southern states. More importantly, these states tend to have very high

levels of poverty. Poverty is a much better predictor of student performance than is race. These states also tend to have high fertility and immigration rates, so their impact on national data will increase over time.

Immigration and Race

In the 1920's, there were about 14 million immigrants in the United States. Almost all of them came from Europe. Today, there are nearly 15 million immigrants in the country, and four out of five come from South America and Asia. The new immigrants represent an incredible diversity. They speak a wide variety of languages. Many arrive with no formal education, while one out of three Asians has a college degree. Although the use of the terms "Asian" and "Hispanic" implies otherwise, there is great cultural diversity within these communities as well. Koreans and Japanese, for example, are "Asians," but their cultures are vastly different and their relations are embedded in historic conflict.

The extreme heterogeneity of today's school-age youth represents a major challenge to our educational system. Nor is this challenge likely to abate any time soon. Fully two-thirds of the world's immigrants gravitate to the United States. Given continued repression and civil war in Asia and South America, and the prospect of relaxed emigration policies by the Soviet Union, it is likely that immigration will continue at a high level for some years to come.

Immigration is one of the primary ways in which minorities are increasing their presence in the United States. A major component of the

recent advance in youth numbers is accounted for by immigration. Although Mexican-American (2.9) and black (2.4) fertility rates are above the replacement level of 2.1 children per female, these population gains are more than offset by the decline in white fertility. Without immigration, the overall population of the United States would not have increased during the last decade.

Increasing minority populations would present an even greater challenge to schools were it not partially offset by changes in the economic circumstances of minorities. In the past, minority almost automatically meant poor, especially when the minority in question was blacks. Fortunately, this is no longer the case. Although minority poverty is still a problem, the black and Hispanic communities have developed substantial middle classes, and they are continuing to grow. This is an important fact to note, because minority children from middle class backgrounds perform like white middle class children. We now know that given the opportunity, youth from all ethnic backgrounds can realize their potential.

Paradoxically, although high school completion rates for all major ethnic groups improved from 1976 to 1986, black and Hispanic college-going rates have declined, according to the American Council on Education's "Seventh Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education" (1989). Especially worrisome is the alarming decline in the participation of black males, whose college enrollment decreased 7.2 percent over the decade. While American elementary and secondary schools are increasingly populated by minority students, the ranks of minority teachers have dropped from 12 to 9 percent. With black and Hispanic college-going rates in decline, this trend will almost certainly continue. It may also contribute to further

accelerating the downward spiral in college-going rates. Assessing the impact of the declining number of black schoolteachers on black males' academic attainment is thus a very important research agenda for the future.

CONCLUSION

Whether it be a particular curriculum or education policy in general, you can't plan for tomorrow without taking a close look at who it is we are planning for. The foregoing analyses and projections provide a reasonably good portrait of the students of the 21st century and what we need to accomplish with them.

Melding our fertility and immigration data, it is clear that our future will be steadily more minority and less white. Shortly after the turn of the century, one out of three adult American citizens will be non-white. At the level of the schools, the most conservative projection (that positing the least ethnic diversity) estimates that 48 percent of students will be minorities. Already, the 30 largest public school systems in the nation are populated by "minority majorities." The schools of three states (New Mexico, Mississippi and Hawaii) are also at this juncture, and an additional five states (California, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina and Texas) currently feature minority enrollments of over 40 percent.

Were the United States still a youth-oriented society, the prospects of marshalling the resources necessary for the schools to serve the variety of ancillary missions we seem to expect (day care, recreation, etc.) while successfully meeting pressing educational challenges might seem bright. We are no longer a youth-oriented society, however. We are a rapidly aging

society faced with difficult resource allocation choices. One may well be between education and health care. Given the increasing size and historically high voter turnout of people over 55, it seems unlikely that intergenerational conflicts will be resolved in favor of the young.

The schools of the 21st century face the challenge of educating future citizens within the context of an entirely new order of pluralism. More than ever before, these students will be characterized by poverty, native languages other than English, physical and emotional handicaps, and ethnic and cultural diversity. Astonishingly, despite these inevitabilities, our present concern is with tightening standards for educational outcomes, rather than taking steps to ensure that every child has a reasonable chance of attaining them.

Demographically, it is the wrong time to orient our schools toward serving as screening mechanisms. We need schools that <u>create</u> winners, not simply schools that <u>pick</u> winners. Our goal should be to make sure that every child succeeds in school. As I concluded a recent article for <u>Educational Leadership</u> (1988), "when students are plentiful, we can just pick the best. But when students are scarce, we need them all to do well. They are too important to fail."

REFERENCES

Boulding, Kenneth. National Forum (Summer 1984).

Hodgkinson, Harold. All One System. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

Office of Minority Concerns. Seventh Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

Roper Organization. The American Chicle Youth Poll. Morris Plains, N.J.: Warner-Lambert Co., 1987.